

DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

**SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

November 3, 2016
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline City Hall
Council Chamber

Commissioners Present

Vice Chair Montero
Commissioner Chang
Commissioner Maul
Commissioner Malek
Commissioner Moss-Thomas

Commissioners Absent

Chair Craft
Commissioner Mork

Staff Present

Rachael Markle, Director, Planning & Community Development
Paul Cohen, Planning Manager, Planning & Community Development
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Development
Kendra Dedinski, Traffic Engineer
Dave Eernisse, Economic Development Director
Julie Ainsworth Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Lisa Basher, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Montero called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk the following Commissioners were present: Vice Chair Montero, and Commissioners Chang, Maul, Malek and Moss-Thomas. Chair Craft and Commissioner Mork were absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 20, 2016 were adopted as corrected.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Pam Cross, Shoreline, said she found Kim Lancaster's comments to the City Council on October 24th with respect to the Planning Commission's meeting regarding transitional encampment legislation to be insulting. Her statement that there was palpable hostility in the meeting is untrue. The only disruption in the meeting was when the people with her waived around some printed material, perhaps signs. Ms. Lancaster stated that the proposed amendments were intended to decrease barriers for churches and other human service organizations, but she failed to say that the actual subject being discussed was housing of encampments in residential backyards. Even her husband's statement includes a request to add individuals as managing agencies and to reduce the setback distance to zero for homeowners. Ms. Cross said she is puzzled by Ms. Lancaster's oversight because churches and other non-profits seem to be doing just fine, but the use of residential backyards is entirely new. It is the untested use of backyards of someone who may have no background or skills in operating such an encampment that needs careful consideration.

Ms. Cross recalled that Ms. Lancaster made it sound as if people who spoke against the changes do not want the homeless in the City. Those who spoke expressed their concerns for the homeless, as well as for the host family by directing attention to several items, one of which was the likelihood that the homeowner's insurance policy of the host family would be cancelled due to the change in liability exposure. This would directly impact the host, as well as the guests, who could be injured while on the property. She said she has since confirmed this with the Office of the Insurance Commissioner, who advised that the host family may also see increased auto insurance rates due to the addition of licensed drivers on the property, depending on what their motor vehicle records are like.

Ms. Cross further recalled that, as Ms. Lancaster noted, those opposed to the amendments (not opposed to homeless people) found out about the Planning Commission meeting the day before or the same day. They didn't even know one another. As a result, their comments were not coordinated. On the other hand, Ms. Lancaster was able to make a nice presentation to the City Council, bringing along some of her homeless associates who talked in a clear and concise way, never repeating what a prior person had said. It was almost as if it had been rehearsed. She said Ms. Lancaster's statement that the alleged hostility is based on fear and lack of knowledge is not born out by the on-point comments of the speakers. Again, she said they are not opposed to church encampments and have no issues with those who are currently without a home. Stating practical considerations for safety, training and control is not hostility, but bringing attention to items that may have been overlooked and should be part of a healthy dialogue. Ms. Lancaster obviously cares very much and has made it clear that she wants to help the homeless, and so do those who have voiced concern. They want to get people who are currently living in tents kept warm, dry and safe; but they wonder how a tent in a residential backyard is warmer, dryer or safer than a church or another non-profit. At the end of the day, the joint goal should be the elimination of tent cities, and not the perpetuation of them.

Margaret Willson, Shoreline, recalled that she addressed the Commission at their last meeting about the proposed amendments related to temporary encampments. She referred to the issue of setbacks and commented that it was recently suggested that tents and port-a-potties should be treated the same as stone barbecues and garden sheds. She pointed out that stone barbecues do not snore, and we don't defecate in our garden sheds. Someone else suggested it would be plain discrimination against some of

Shoreline's most vulnerable citizens to not allow backyard homeless camps. She agreed that it would be discrimination if they allowed backyard boy scout camps, but not backyard homeless camps, but it would not be discrimination to prohibit all backyard camps, which is what she felt the City should do. It was also suggested that Shoreline try a limited social experiment for three years and then reevaluate. She referred to the current situation in Seattle since it stopped enforcing camping regulations. There are now outdoor camps all over, and homeless drug addicts from all over the country are coming to Seattle because it is easier. She does not want Shoreline open to this same thing. The homeless population could quadruple, and the camps could become permanent. She has also heard that opposition to the camps is based on irrational fear. She recalled that, at the last Commission meeting, ten Shoreline residents provided fact-based reasons why the camps are a bad idea. There were also 17 sets of comments on the City's website with fact-based reasons. Saying that the opposition is based on irrational fear belittles, but does not refute the arguments.

Ms. Willson commented that she believes the tone of the conversation is getting unpleasant. The first time she looked on the City's website, there were 17 comments against encampments; but the next time she looked, there were only 16. She discovered through a conversation on Next Door Richmond Beach that one person had removed her name because she received hate mail and she didn't want her email address on the website any more. The opponents of the camps have also been accused of racism, which is totally out of line; and the proponents have been threatening lawsuits against the City if it doesn't allow the camps in backyards despite the opposition of most Shoreline citizens. She concluded that little good comes of conversations that devolve to this level. What needs to be done, instead, is figuring out what would be effective. Everyone agrees they need to address the plight of the homeless, and they should be researching what has worked in other cities and implementing similar programs in Shoreline. She noted that she submitted an email with more information on the topic.

Tom McCormick, Shoreline, reviewed that, last year the City Council adopted Resolution 377, which pertains to Richmond Beach Drive and states, "*the current 4,000 daily traffic volume limit remains in full force and affect until such time that Policy 12 of the Point Wells Subarea Plan is amended to increase it.*" The resolution also says that "*until the Point Wells Plan is repealed or amended, the City shall not take any action inconsistent with the 4,000-trip limit.*" However, one of the items on the docket of 2016 Comprehensive Plan Amendments is to establish a .65 Volume/Capacity (VC) ratio or lower for Richmond Beach Drive (Amendment 8) that would result in seven to ten or more average daily trips. He questioned how the amendment can even be presented to the Commission when the City Council has agreed that no action can be taken inconsistent with the 4,000 limit. When the proposed amendment is considered later on the agenda, he would like the Commission to determine that it is inappropriate to consider as it is in violation of Resolution 377. Alternatively, the Commission could change the .65 V/C ratio to establish an upper limit that does not exceed the 4,000 limit. He concluded that as the proposed amendment stands, it would be inappropriate for the Commission to consider it.

Mr. McCormick also referred to proposed Amendment 6, which is also on the docket of Comprehensive Plan amendments. Amendment 6 talks about establishing a 90% capacity limit for Richmond Beach Road west of 8th Avenue. While the City has stated that the amendment is redundant because it is covered elsewhere in another docketed item, Mr. McCormick suggested that the amendment would not be redundant if the other docketed item is not passed. He urged the Commission to adopt Amendment 6. In addition, he suggested that Amendment 6 should be expanded to extend all the way to 3rd Avenue.

He reminded the Commission that the City has applied for a grant from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) requesting funds so it can restripe the segment between 3rd and 8th Avenues as three lanes.

PUBLIC HEARING: DRAFT ORDINANCE NUMBER 765 – NEW REGULATIONS FOR SELF STORAGE FACILITIES

Vice Chair Montero reviewed the rules and procedures for the hearing and then opened the hearing.

Staff Presentation

Director Markle reviewed that there is currently a moratorium in place on the acceptance of applications for new self-storage facilities. The moratorium was enacted because the code does not clearly address where self-service storage facilities are permitted; the use tables need to be updated to reflect adopted plans, goals and policies; and there has been a recent dramatic increase related to the development of self-storage facilities in the City. Currently, there are four facilities that were established between 1978 and 1989 under King County codes, and one that was constructed in 2004. In the past year, the City has permitted two and received six proposals for self-storage facilities. This alerted staff to an influx of self-storage facilities and led to the moratorium.

Director Markle said some issues staff has been exploring over the past few months are concerns about design. Many of the older self-storage facilities have blank walls and are sprawling, one-story, auto-centric buildings constructed of unattractive materials. Another concern is that self-storage facilities are incompatible with adjacent uses and allow outdoor storage. In addition, there is concern that the City has a limited amount of commercial property to meet its needs and visions for the future, and self-storage is a very long-term use that is not typically converted to another use once established. To address these concerns, she reviewed each of the proposed amendments as follows:

- **Amendment 1 (SMC 20.20.046.S)**

The definition for “Self-Storage Facility” was updated to be in line with the State’s definition.

- **Amendment 2 (SMC 20.20.046.W)**

The definition for “warehousing” was also updated to make it clear that warehousing is not self-storage.

- **Amendment 3 (Table 20.40.230)**

This amendment addresses which zones self-storage facilities should be permitted or prohibited. As proposed, “self-storage facilities” would specifically be added to the Nonresidential Uses Table as permitted with index criteria in all Mixed Business (MB) zones and in the Community Business (CB) zone along Ballinger Way NE only and prohibited in all other zones. In addition, the use would be specifically prohibited in the Aurora Square Community Renewal Area (CRA), on arterial corners, or within ¼ mile of another self-storage facility.

Director Markle advised that the City received a number of comments from self-storage representatives, who provided good factual information and ideas about the proposed regulations. One comment suggested that self-storage also be allowed in other CB zones on parcels that take access from a state highway. This would include the CB zones on Lake City Way in Southeast Shoreline. This change would result in the use also being allowed along Aurora Avenue North, Ballinger Way NE and Bothell Way NE.

- **Amendment 4a (SMC 20.40.505.A)**

The City uses the Supplemental Index Criteria to permit a use subject to meeting criteria that are intended to make the use compliant with the purpose of a particular zone. Staff has proposed several supplemental index criteria for self-storage facilities. The intent is to further define where self-storage facilities are permitted or prohibited, specify how self-storage units can and cannot be used, and add design standards specific to self-storage facilities. The proposed criteria include the following:

1. ***Self-storage facilities shall not be permitted on property located on a corner on an arterial street.*** The intent of this provision is to preserve a developable area on each of the corners where arterials intersect so that uses can develop there that are of a pedestrian scale, activate the streetscape, contribute to placemaking and create jobs. To make the intent clearer, staff is proposing that the following sentence be added, ***“For the purposes of this criterion, corners are defined as all private property adjacent to two or more intersecting arterial streets for a minimum distance of 200 feet in length by a width of 200 feet as measured from the property lines that face the arterials.”*** If the Commission supports the corner restriction concept, a picture would ideally be added to the code. The new language would yield an approximately 40,000 square foot parcel or parcels at the corners where self-storage would be prohibited.
2. ***Self-storage facilities shall not be located within ¼ mile measured from the property line of the proposed site to another existing or permitted self-storage facility.*** A map was used to illustrate the location of the four existing and two permitted self-storage facilities in relation to the six proposed self-storage facilities. Staff is recommending the “distance from” regulation to prevent the overconcentration of self-storage facilities in a particular area, and either 500 feet or ¼ mile will effectively serve this purpose. However, applying a “distance from” requirement on Ballinger Way NE would essentially preclude new self-storage facilities in the area. If the Commission believes that self-storage facilities should be allowed in the Ballinger area, they should not enact a “distance from” restriction in that location. Staff is seeking feedback from the Commission about whether there should be a “distance from” requirement; and if so, what should the exact measurement be.

As written, the proposed “distance from” requirement would also apply to permitted projects. This raises questions about what happened if there are two self-storage facility projects under permit review at the same time that would be located within a ¼-mile or 500-foot radius of each other. Allowing the project that is issued a building permit first and denying the second permit that is under review would create an unpredictable permitting process.

The Commission could also consider one or more exceptions to the “distance from” requirement to ideally require self-storage facility projects to include elements that directly address the City’s vision, goals and policies. For example, there could be an exception if 75% of the required ground floor commercial space is devoted to other permitted uses in the zone besides self-storage. If the issue is that self-storage will take up valuable commercial space that could be developed with something more active that produces more jobs, this requirement would activate the ground level but allow a self-storage use to occur on the upper floors. Another exception could be to allow the facilities to locate within the radius of an existing or permitted facility with a Conditional Use Permit, if the existing facility has been operational for five years, based upon a market study showing demand for the additional square footage, or based on a maximum total rentable space within a radius. The latter option could be a possible solution to the problem of when two permits come in at the same time.

- **Amendment 4b (SMC 20.40.505.B)**

Based on research of other jurisdictions, staff is also recommending Supplemental Index Criteria that regulates how self-storage units are used. These regulations are intended to address community concerns about safety and compatibility with neighboring uses. As proposed, the index criteria would prohibit: living in storage units; manufacturing in storage units; conducting estate and garage sales from storage units; storing flammable, perishable and hazardous materials in storage units; and outdoor storage. Staff has not received any negative feedback related to these proposed restrictions, and the rules seems to be standard operating procedure.

- **Amendment 4c (SMC 20.40.505.C)**

Staff recommends the adoption of Supplemental Index Criteria to ensure the design of self-storage facilities promotes the City’s vision and is compatible with newly redeveloped sites and future redevelopment. The recommended design requirements include:

1. All facilities are to be multi-story.
2. All access to storage units shall be from the interior of the facility.
3. Loading docks and bays must be screened.
4. Standards for fences and walls.
5. 35% glazing on all floors above the ground floor.
6. Prohibiting the use of certain building materials.
7. Requiring the use of muted exterior colors.
8. Prohibiting installation of electrical outlets in storage units.

Staff received a fair amount of feedback regarding the proposed design requirements and their practicality. For example:

- A comment was received about the requirement that “*no unit may face the street or be visible from off of the property.*” The commenter concluded that the requirement conflicts with the glazing requirement because the doors would be visible through the glazing. The purpose of

the windows, in this case, would be more to dress the building to look like an office. The windows could appear glazed on the outside, but there would be another wall that obscures the inside. If the Commission disagrees with this concept of glazing, it could recommend removing the clause “*or be visible from off the property.*”

9. A comment was received regarding the amount of glazing. Mr. Ricks provided the Commission with an estimate of the glazing of various elevations of the proposed project. This information may be helpful to the Commission to decide the proper amount of glazing to require. His project was one of the examples shown at the last meeting, and the entire building is about 15% glazing. Some floors have more or less than others.
10. There were also questions about how it would look and feel to have a lot of glazing facing residential uses. It could be seemingly intrusive, create glare, have light all night, etc.
11. A comment was received regarding consideration of metal panels. The commenter stated the panels are thick and durable and they had planned to use them. The City’s adopted Commercial Design Standards allow for metal panels, and removing the prohibition may be appropriate if enough other design standards remain in place to preclude the construction of a large, metal warehouse style facility. These other design standards include modulation, variation in roofline, some glazing, colors, etc.

Director Markle explained that following the public hearing, the Commission will likely formulate a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed regulations. The recommendation will be presented to the City Council on November 28th for a study session. The City Council is likely to take action on the proposed amendments following their public hearing on December 12th.

Director Markle concluded her presentation by recommending approval of draft Ordinance Number 765 to establish new regulations for self-storage facilities with consideration of amending SMC 20.40.505(A)(1) as proposed in the presentation. She reminded the Board that SMC 20.40.505(A)(1) is the proposed additional language relative to corners.

Clarifying Questions from the Commission

Commissioner Chang said she has concerns about the limited number of commercial properties to meet the City’s needs and vision, which is why the moratorium was put in place. She requested clarification from staff about the impacts (jobs, tax revenue, etc.) of self-storage versus other types of mixed-use development. Director Markle advised that property tax is the main tax revenue that comes from self-storage, along with some utility tax. The use would generate very little or no sales tax. As an example, a commenter pointed out that the site of the proposed facility on 19th Avenue NE is located in the middle of developed commercial area but has remained undeveloped for 20 years. Development of the self-storage facility will result in additional property tax revenue based on the improvements. In another example, the City receives about \$12,000 in property tax from the existing self-storage facility on Ballinger Way NE. By comparison, many of the newer apartment buildings have 10-year property tax exemptions, so the City is not receiving taxes on the improvements. The property tax received from these developments is currently similar to the property tax received from self-storage. She does not

have an example of the properties taxes generated by a mixed-use development, but properties taxes are based on valuation. Sales tax and utility taxes will be more on a commercial building versus a self-storage facility.

Commissioner Malek observed that eight developers from the Seattle area have submitted permit applications for self-storage facilities in Shoreline. He recognized that land values are high in Seattle, but he asked if the less strict land regulations also attract developers to Shoreline. Director Markle said she never got confirmation that the City's regulations were more amenable in relation to Seattle, but she believes the City's regulations are more amenable than those of Lake Forest Park and Edmonds. In talking with the developers, it is not likely that all eight will end up developing, as the market dynamic will change once the new facilities come on line.

Commissioner Malek asked if it would be better to use size as a means of separating the facilities from one another rather than imposing a ¼-mile radius or another arbitrary number. Director Markle agreed that option would preclude an overconcentration, but she is not clear which option would be the most effective without doing an analysis.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas commented that, at the end of the day, they want something that looks good, and she questioned if glazing is really the best way to achieve this goal. Perhaps there are other alternatives such as an artistic design or the articulation required in the general commercial design standards. She expressed her belief that the design standards should remain consistent from one type of development to another. Having different design standards for self-service storage facilities can create a lot of confusion. Director Markle agreed there are other alternatives that would be attractive and acceptable, and the Commission may want to reduce the amount of glazing to allow for that type of treatment, as well. The design standards allude to being able to do that, but they do not prescribe one particular method over another. The intent is to direct the design to be different than the typical, large and boxy designs that would not meet the City's current design guidelines.

Commissioner Malek asked if it would be reasonable to discriminate between the CB and MB zones. It seems reasonable that the scale and scope of the fringe areas like Ballinger Way NE and 145th Street at Bothell WA NE would be different than what you would expect to see along Aurora Avenue N. He asked if the use could be regulated differently based on zoning in terms of scale, scope and size. He explained that his intent is to hold the facilities to the scale and scope of other development in the immediate environment. However, he does not want to complicate the language in the code so much that it is difficult or unwelcoming for incoming developers to decipher. Director Markle said it would be very easy to place limitation on the size and scale of the use in the CB zone. They might seek direction during the hearing about what is considered large and smaller-scale self-storage facilities.

Commissioner Chang said she is concerned when looking at the map that identifies the location of the existing and proposed new self-storage facilities. She also has sympathy for people who own the properties and have already gone through the design process. They've invested a lot of money and time putting their proposals together. Even with the proposed amendments, there would still be other places where self-storage facilities would be allowed to develop in the City. Director Markle agreed there would still be a few properties available for self-storage, but the market will play into whether or not new facilities are developed. Commissioner Chang asked if self-storage facilities are allowed in Lake

Forest Park and Edmonds. Director Markle answered that they are not allowed in Lake Forest Park, and Edmonds' regulations are not extraordinarily clear.

Commissioner Chang suggested that the City could accept the applications that have already been proposed, but then not allow any more. Assistant Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor commented that the City could take this approach if it is determined to be in the best interest of the citizens. She noted that the City already outright prohibits certain uses, and the same could be done for self-service storage facilities. This would be an overall policy decision for the City Council to make.

Vice Chair Montero asked if any of the current self-storage facilities allow outside storage. Director Markle said the facility on Midvale Avenue has outside storage, but she is not familiar with what is allowed at the other facilities. Vice Chair Montero concluded that a citizen of Shoreline would have to go outside of the City to find storage for recreational vehicles.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked staff's rationale for the proposed requirement that no more than 25% of the ground floor space could be used for self-storage, and the remaining 75% would require some other type of commercial use. While she understands the intent of requiring commercial uses along the street front, she voiced concern that 75% could be excessive, depending on the size and shape of the lot. Director Markle said the existing Commercial Design Standards require commercial uses along the street frontage to a depth of 20 feet. That would be the intent for this regulation, too. She agreed there should be some correlation between the commercial space and the actual street frontage, and 25% was thrown out for feedback and public comment. Rather than a scientific number, it was intended to be enough to allow space for the commercial use required for self-storage, as well as other commercial uses. She said she did not receive any feedback from the development community regarding this provision. Commissioner Moss-Thomas clarified that that the standard, whatever is applied, would only apply to the portion of property facing the street fronts, and only for a certain depth.

Mr. Cohen said it is important to remember that self-storage is allowed as an accessory use in Mixed Use Residential (MUR) zones. The idea is that there is a need for people living in the multi-family developments to have self-storage as an accessory use. However, the facility would not be at the same scale as the existing and proposed self-storage facilities.

Public Testimony

Randall Olsen, Seattle, Land Use Attorney, Cairncross & Hempelmann, said he was present to represent Sherry Development, the proponent of the project at 14553 Bothell Way NE. The property is located about three lots north of the intersection of 145th Street and Bothell Way NE. It is zoned CB and developed with an existing storage facility that has been permitted and is currently under construction immediately south of the property. He referred to a letter he submitted prior to the meeting, which contains his detailed thoughts and summarized the following requests:

- He recommended that self-storage facilities be permitted in all CB and MB zones that take access from a State Highway. The facilities should be located on properties that are primarily auto-oriented and capable of serving a broader region rather than the immediate neighborhood. Properties in the CB zone that meet this goal are the ones that front on a State Highway (Ballinger Way NE and

Bothell Way NE). The Staff Report suggests that self-storage facilities be permitted in the CB zones, but only on Ballinger Way NE, and it is difficult to see why the use would make sense on Ballinger Way NE but not on Bothell Way NE.

- He expressed his belief that the “distance from” requirement is complicated and probably unnecessary for many reasons. For example, the market will limit the number of uses there will be. The idea of having a maximum square footage for self-storage in a particular area might be a much more workable approach. If the City considers this option, he suggested 250,000 square feet would be a number that would allow two viable projects to occur, but would not be so large as to trigger concerns.
- If the Commission chooses to go forward with a dispersion requirement that has commercial on the ground floor, he requested that it be based upon the frontage of the property. The Sherry property has a small amount of frontage and most of the site is located in the back. Having that ratio taken into consideration would be the way to go.

Michael Sherry, Bainbridge Island, said he is the developer of the project at 14553 Bothell Way NE. He explained that this site, in particular, has very limited other options for development. The traffic is very fast along Bothell Way NE, and access is limited to right-in and right-out. A high-speed bus lane goes right past the property, as well. In terms of meeting the objectives of the CB zone, the site has limitations that are traffic oriented. In addition, the neighborhood is not all that conducive to other options. Surrounding developments include a McDonalds, another storage facility, and a strip club across the street. He said the market analysis indicates that an additional self-storage facility is warranted in this location. He said his analysis of the distinction between MU-2 and MU-1, which are defined in the Comprehensive Plan, is contrary to what staff says. He believes MU-2 would actually be more appropriate for self-storage, and his property is identified as MU-2 under the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, it does not make sense to him that only self-storage would have a distance limitation from its competitors. He is not aware of any other uses in the City where a distance measurement is applied. The market place does a very good job of limiting the number of self-storage facilities that are developed over time.

Mr. Sherry referred to the proposed 75% commercial requirement. He explained that his site has a minimal amount of frontage along Bothell Way NE and most of the site is around back. The building footprint is about 36,000 square feet, so 75% of the first floor as commercial space would result in approximately 26,000 square feet of non-rentable space. The very front could be used, but he cannot imagine a tenant would pay commercial rates to use the spaces around the back. Wasted space costs about \$70 to \$80 per foot, which equates to about a \$2 million penalty for his project to be located next door to a competitor. In addition, an additional 65 parking stalls would be required, consuming another substantial part of the property. He does not believe having more parking lots is an objective of the Commission. He asked the Commission to reconsider this requirement, and he is encouraged by the previous discussion that the requirement would only apply to a small footprint against the active street front. He stressed the importance of considering the practical cost aspects about what the impact would be on a building with that kind of requirement.

Robin Murphy, Seattle, said his design firm in Seattle designs a lot of self-storage facilities. He observed that a lot of the discussion is centered on aesthetics and preventing the buildings from being large, blank boxes. His firm also designs theaters, which have a similar issue. You cannot put a lot of fenestration on a theater, but the building must be integrated into the fabric of the surrounding area. For storage, they have determined the best formula is to concentrate glazing, both vertically and horizontally, into the areas that are facing the right-of-way. It is important that the buildings are read as storage buildings rather than disguised as office buildings, but they can be designed effectively to meet design requirements by placing the windows in positions where it reads what the building actually provides to the customers. This design keeps windows away from areas that are inappropriate, such as single- and multi-family residential development and other interior lot lines. He explained that windows are very important in storage, and placing them at the end of corridors allows natural lighting into the spaces and provides a sense of security and understanding of where you are. However, imposing a 35% to 50% window requirement around the perimeter of the building does not make sense. The average office building has approximately 35% window to wall area, and the energy code for metal buildings limits the design to 30% windows. A more stringent requirement would require the developer to prescriptively over-insulate to counter affect the fact that too many holes were poked into the metal building.

Mr. Murphy commented that, generally, two types of materials are used for self-storage facilities: masonry and metal siding. While this may sound like a small pallet, there is an endless variety of articulations of those materials, profiles and colors. There are many ways to modulate the buildings both vertically and horizontally. Windows are part of that, but to require the facility to look like something other than what is it would be a mistake.

Mr. Murphy expressed his belief that self-storage facilities need to be approximately 100,000 gross square feet, which equates to a footprint of about 33,000 square feet for a 3-story building. Requiring that 75% of the ground floor must be a commercial use other than storage would result in a 20,000 square foot footprint that is basically unusable. He reminded the Commissioners that self-storage facilities are not typically located on prime real estate. They are in secondary areas that are zoned for commercial, but not necessarily in a location that a retail tenant would want to occupy.

Holly Golden, Seattle, Land Use Attorney, Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson, said she works with Lake Union Partners on their site at 19237 Aurora Avenue North. She voiced support for the draft ordinance and encouraged the Commission to move it along to the City Council for approval. She commented that the site on Aurora Avenue North is perfectly situated for self-storage, and the proposed legislation would allow it. However, she requested some simple changes to the draft ordinance.

Ms. Golden explained that for the proposal at 19237 Aurora Avenue North, the 35% glazing requirement and the restriction on any metal panels would be problematic. She noted that a comment letter she previously provided included a rendering of the proposed building. As currently designed, it does use metal panels and it has less than 35% glazing. The glazing requirement is tricky, and good design can be achieved through other methods. Especially for a use that does not have occupants, it is difficult to set a hardline rule. She does not support the idea of “fake” windows. The facility is not an office building, and it seems silly to try and make it look like one. As explained earlier by Mr. Murphy, windows in the building can be useful features. The ability to see some of the doors through the

windows would run counter to that and would encourage the fake windows with the fake wall behind it. She asked the Commission to reconsider the restriction on the visibility of doors through the windows.

Ms. Golden also commented that metal panels are versatile and durable, and they are allowed under the current Commercial Design Standards above four feet. It seems reasonable, with all the other design requirements, that it would work in this setting as well. She recommended that the restriction on metal panels be removed. She suggested that another fix to address design concerns would be to allow design departures. Although design departures are currently allowed from the Commercial Design Standards, Item C.9 in the proposed ordinance would prohibit design departures for self-storage facilities. She emphasized that self-storage is often appropriate at difficult sites that are not being used for other multi-family or commercial uses. Flexibility needs to be allowed to account for unusual, site-specific characteristics. Again, she voiced her support for legislation that allows self-storage facilities in Shoreline on appropriate sites like 19327 Aurora Avenue North, and she encouraged the Commission to move the draft legislation forward to City Council.

Joe Ferguson, Shoreline, Lake Union Partners, said his firm is the developer of the property at 19237 Aurora Avenue North. He is also a resident of Shoreline and he is encouraged by the proposed restrictions, specifically in areas with adopted neighborhood plans. His firm also develops a wide variety of mixed-use urban housing and retail in urban locations throughout the northwest, including Seattle, Portland and Salt Lake City; and they have a good perspective on what makes for a great neighborhood. Restrictions on corners make sense, as do restrictions in town centers and subareas where the City is trying to encourage vibrant street use. He said he would also support a reasonable radius restriction, as long as it is applied consistently throughout the City. It would be somewhat silly and unpredictable to assign different rules to different locations. He also voiced support for the previous comments relative to the glazing requirement. He explained that there is a need for authenticity to the use. There is a demand within the market, and developers are seeing opportunity based on this demand. It is a fairly simple equation to identify where and how much square footage of storage would be absorbed in a certain radius. With that in mind, he encouraged the Commission to let the market speak. Let developers build into that demand, and trust the fact that they are going to have trouble getting financing if it does not exist. A size restriction may sound good in concept, but the intent is to avoid the concentration of the use within an area. Regardless of whether the facility is 100,000 or 200,000 square feet, at issue is how the use is experienced at the street.

John Limantzakis, Seattle, said he and his family have owned the parcel on Bothell Way NE between 145th and 146th Avenues for just shy of 20 years. While they have been required to pay property taxes for all of those years, only approximately 6,000 square feet of the site generates revenue. They have been trying to redevelop the property for a number of years, and many different avenues have been considered. However, they have been unable to do anything, particularly when the left-turn lane was cut off to have access to the property. He expressed his belief that Mr. Sherry's proposal is a good fit for the property; not just for him, but there will also be land remaining for another type of commercial use.

Rodger Ricks, Redmond, said he is a former resident of Shoreline. He referred to a letter he submitted prior to the meeting and summarized some of the points it contained. He recalled that, at their last meeting, the Commission seemed to favor self-storage as a use in the community, but it should be appropriately distributed and not take away from prime commercial parcels. There seems to be a bit of a

tone that self-storage is an undesirable use that needs to be shielded, but that is not the case. One of every 10 households use self-storage, and they need to be located conveniently.

Mr. Ricks said he is proposing a new self-storage facility on 19th Avenue NE in the Ballinger District. He agreed with Director Markle that the radius requirement would not be appropriate for the Ballinger District because it is such a concentrated area. If a radius requirement is applied, no additional self-storage facilities would be allowed. There are currently two self-storage facilities in the Ballinger area, an older one that allows outdoor storage and a newer one that is very small. A third-party demand consultant identified a demand for 161,000 square feet in that location, yet the current facilities only provide 90,000 square feet. The area is very underserved at this time. He noted that the parcel has been vacant for 22 years. While it has been cleared, no development proposal has made sense. The occupancy levels of the existing facilities in Ballinger are extremely high, and they are charging much more than surrounding communities.

Mr. Ricks agreed with the previous concerns relative to glazing. He said he attempted to apply some of the concepts suggested by Mr. Murphy, such as putting lights at the ends of hallways so it is convenient for all patrons in the facilities and putting the signature on the front to demonstrate the building's use. He asked that the Commission consider reducing the glazing requirement to a more reasonable level.

Paul Ribary, North Bend, said he is the general contractor for the facility being constructed at 16523 Aurora Avenue N, which broke ground about four weeks ago. As a builder, he has done about 25 storage facilities in the last 15 years and a number of things have changed during that time. Specifically, he referred to the glazing requirement and how it relates to the energy code. He agreed with Mr. Murphy as far as the impact of the glazing requirement on a developer's ability to meet the energy code. On a cold day, you will end up with a very cold facility, which is contrary to the need to make it warm and inviting to the customers and meet the state energy requirements. There is also a cost consideration of glazing versus other options that meet the design requirements. He agreed that windows are important to provide light during the day and advertising and awareness of what the facility is. He noted that it is about 3.5 times more expensive to install siding that is glazed versus metal, hardy or block. In the construction industry, his job is to keep costs down for his clients. He invited the Commissioners to visit the construction site at any time.

Vice Chair Montero closed the public portion of the hearing.

Commission Deliberation and Possible Action

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION ADOPT DRAFT ORDINANCE 765 AND THE ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT CODE CHANGES AS PROPOSED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she believes there is a demand for self-storage facilities in the City, and there are some parcels that are not well leant to other types of development. She would like the use of these properties to be maximized. The goal of the design guidelines is to have attractive buildings, but she doesn't know if the glazing requirement is the right approach. Although those in the industry believe it is important that the facilities are easily recognized as self-storage, there is also concern that

there not be a lot of large, boxy buildings that have little articulation and do not blend into the character the City is trying to achieve as part of its vision. The discussion should consider the best approach to accomplish both goals. She said she supports keeping the design standards consistent for all buildings types in the MB and CB zones. Applying different standards to specific types of development can create confusion for the community, property owners and developers.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT THE LANGUAGE IN SMC 20.40.505.A.2 BE AMENDED BY ELIMINATING THE EXCEPTION AND REPHRASING THE FIRST PARAGRAPH TO READ, “*SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES IN THE MB ZONE NOT TO EXCEED 250,000 SQUARE FEET AND TO A SUBSTANTIALLY LESSER EXTENT WITHIN THE CB ZONE.*”

Commissioner Malek said he does not have a mathematical calculation for what belongs in the CB versus the MB zone, but he feels a fringe zone is something that can accommodate more square footage. He asked about the cumulative square footage of the two existing and one proposed self-storage facilities in the Ballinger CB zone. Director Markle said there is just one existing, and she does not know the exact size of either the existing or proposed facility.

Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor suggested that the language in the motion should provide more specificity. Commissioner Malek commented that if a reasonable size is 100,000 square feet, the percentage of useable square footage would be substantially less than the total size of the building. Mr. Cohen asked if this would be square footage of building or lot, and Commissioner Malek answered that he was referring to the gross square footage of the building.

COMMISSIONER MALEK RESTATED HIS MOTION TO MOVE THAT THE LANGUAGE IN AMENDMENT 4a (SMC 20.40.505.A.2) BE AMENDED BY ELIMINATING THE EXCEPTION AND REPHRASING THE FIRST PARAGRAPH TO READ, “*SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES IN THE MB ZONE AGGREGATE ARE NOT TO EXCEED 300,000 SQUARE FEET AND NOT MORE THAN 150,000 SQUARE FEET IN THE CB ZONE.* COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION FOR DISCUSSION.

Commissioner Maul commented that the language proposed in the motion seems wide open because it does not specify in what distance the limitation applies to. He said he would be willing to eliminate Item 2 entirely and leave it unrestricted. If there is 300,000 square feet of self-storage in an area, the price will drop like a rock, and a developer might think twice about that level of competition. He expressed his belief that none of the options put forward for limiting the number of facilities makes sense to him. He does not anticipate there will be an overly huge concentration of self-storage facilities being constructed in any of the locations. Mr. Ricks advised that, generally, the industry calculates based on net rentable space, and there is about 90,000 square feet of existing space and the new project would add about 80,000 more.

Commissioner Malek said if a volume of self-storage is located anywhere in the City, it should be in the MB zones and not the CB zones. The intent of his motion was to provide a frame of reference to be evaluated. The motion promotes the concept of having a disparity between the two zones. The “distance from” requirement seems more esoteric and less intuitive.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas agreed with Commissioner Maul. She is not sure that the restriction, as a whole, will meet the intent. Again, she recommended that the Commercial Design Standards should be applied universally to get attractive buildings, which is the ultimate goal. She does not have an issue with the type of businesses allowed, as the design standards will govern the appearance of any new development. She understands the need to make the buildings easily recognizable to customers, but the demand for storage is high and people who are looking for it will find it whether hidden in an unusual area or not.

Commissioner Chang agreed there is a need for storage but expressed her belief that there must be limits placed on the use. There is a certain vision for how they want the City to build out, and having some limit would be appropriate. She supports the proposed “distance from” requirement. Vice Chair Montero agreed there should be some restrictions in place, but he believes the use should be more restrictive in the CB zone than in the MB zone. He noted that the MB zones are primarily located adjacent to the two station subareas or along State highways, which lends them to having a higher concentration of self-storage facilities. The MB zones are also located closer to residential areas and other municipalities that have higher restrictions for self-storage facilities. Director Markle reviewed a map and pointed out the locations of the CB and MB zones.

Commissioner Maul voiced concern that, as proposed, the limitation would apply to all CB and MB zones, yet staff has proposed that the use be prohibited in some of these zones. Commissioner Malek said the intent was to exclude the use in the Aurora Square CRA and other areas as previously stated by staff.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY AINSWORTH-TAYLOR SUMMARIZED THE MOTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS: STRIKE THE EXCEPTION LANGUAGE IN SMC 20.40.505.A.2 IN ITS ENTIRETY AND REPLACE THE LANGUAGE IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF ITEM 2 TO READ, “*SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES LOCATED IN THE CB ZONE SHALL NOT EXCEED A GROSS BUILDING AGGREGATE SIZE OF 300,000 SQUARE FEET AND THOSE IN THE MB ZONE 150,000 SQUARE FEET.*”

THE MOTION FAILED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT THE EXCEPTION IN SMC 20.40.505.A.2 BE REPLACED WITH THE FOLLOWING: “*AGGREGATE STORAGE UNITS IN THE MB ZONE WOULD NOT BE GREATER THAN 250,000 SQUARE FEET.*” THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.A.2 BE ELIMINATED ALTOGETHER. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Maul commented that placing limitations on the use would be difficult. Telling a property owner he/she can’t do self-storage because there is already one next door would be unfair. He does not see the use proliferating to an unacceptable level. Until he hears a better idea for how to limit the use, he would like Item 2 to be eliminated.

THE MOTION CARRIED 4-1, WITH COMMISSIONER CHANG VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.A.4 BE AMENDED TO ALLOW SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES TO LOCATE IN CB ZONES THAT ARE ADJACENT TO STATE HIGHWAYS.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas expressed her belief that the use would be appropriate along both Ballinger Way NE and Bothell Way NE. Mr. Cohen pointed out that there are a number of other state highways in the City with CB zoning. Director Markle also pointed out that the proposed change would preclude the applicant on 19th Avenue NE from locating a self-storage facility. Although the property is located in the CB zone, it is not adjacent to a State highway. Commissioner Moss-Thomas said the intent of her motion was to allow the use on Bothell Way NE.

COMMISSIONER MOSS WITHDREW HER MOTION.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.A.4 BE ELIMINATED. COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION FOR DISCUSSION.

Commissioner Maul asked the logic behind limiting the use to CB zones that are adjacent to Ballinger Way NE and 19th Avenue NE only. Director Markle explained that the City and public has spent a lot of time talking about what the character of some neighborhoods should be and how they should be developed, etc. Some of these areas are zoned CB and are not very large. For example, if a 40,000 to 60,000 square foot site in Ridgecrest were allowed to develop with self-storage, it would consume a large portion of the neighborhood. Staff does not believe this use would meet the intended vision. The same is true for the North City Neighborhood, which is intended to be more walkable with on-the-street interest. If self-storage is allowed in all CB zones, the use will be allowed in North City, Ridgecrest, and even the Richmond Beach Shopping Center area.

Commissioner Moss agreed that self-storage facilities do not belong in Ridgecrest or in North City, which have subarea plans in place to guide future development. Director Markle shared a suggestion from Mr. Eernisse to change SMC 20.40.505.A.4 to read, "*All self-storage facilities to locate in CB zones that are primarily served by State highways.*" Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor voiced concern about the meaning of the word, "primary." She cautioned that a traffic analysis would be required for each proposal to determine if a site is primarily served by a State highway or not.

THE MOTION FAILED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.A.4 BE AMENDED TO READ, "IN THE COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONE, SELF-STORAGE FACILITIES ARE ALLOWED ADJACENT TO BALLINGER WAY NE, BOTHELL WAY NE AND 19TH AVENUE NE ONLY." COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas observed that the Commercial Design Standards already include standards for glazing and commercial uses on the ground floor. Director Markle clarified that the existing glazing standard only applies to the front façade on the ground floor. The proposed additional design requirement would require glazing on upper floors, as well. Mr. Cohen pointed out that multi-family and office development typically includes windows on all floors anyway, and that is why glazing is only emphasized on the ground floor. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that, theoretically, the existing Commercial Design Standards would allow an office or multifamily development to be constructed without windows. Mr. Cohen clarified that the glazing standard was not intended for movie theaters and storage. If the motion is to use the existing Commercial Design Standards, the examples of self-storage facilities that were provided would meet the requirement for ground floor glazing, and no glazing would be required above the first floor.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.C.5 BE ELIMINATED. THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.C.5 BE AMENDED TO READ, “A MINIMUM WINDOW AREA SHALL BE 20% OF EACH FLOOR ABOVE THE GROUND FLOOR OF A SELF-STORAGE FACILITY BUILDING THAT IS VISIBLE FROM A STREET.” COMMISSIONER MAUL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas said her motion was intended to be a compromise between the staff’s proposed 35% requirement, which seems to be a lot, and nothing. She is most concerned about the facades that are visible from a street. She wants to get away from the feeling of a big, boxy façade. She understands that business owners do not feel it is necessary for self-storage facilities to blend in with the surrounding development. However, many jurisdictions require certain design standards for facades that are visible from the street. She chose 20% as an arbitrary number based on the examples that were provided.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO CHANGE “SMC 20.40.505.C.5 TO READ, “A MINIMUM WINDOW AREA SHALL BE 20% OF EACH FLOOR ABOVE THE GROUND FLOOR OF A SELF-STORAGE FACILITY BUILDING THAT IS VISIBLE FROM A STREET OR FACING A RIGHT-OF-WAY.” COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND. THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Maul pointed out that glazing of more than 30% of the entire building creates a problem in meeting the energy code. Requiring 20%, or even 35%, glazing only on the facades facing the street or right-of-way, would allow projects to stay below this threshold. He said he does not mind seeing doors through the glass, and great examples were provided at their last meeting. He is not so sure that a 35% requirement would be outrageous if it only applies to the facades facing the street. Perhaps they should leave it at 35% and allow for departures as staff decisions. He noted that the project on Bothell Way NE has very little façade facing the street, so meeting the 35% requirement would not be difficult.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas commented that as long as there are other ways to make the streetscape attractive, it does not have to be done through glazing. However, it seems like glazing has been used as

a tool in other jurisdictions. Regardless of what is inside, the exterior needs to be visually attractive from the streetscape.

THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Moss noted that SMC 20.40.505.C.9 does not allow departures from the Commercial Design Standards for self-storage facilities. She asked why staff is proposing more stringent requirements on this one type of business over another. Mr. Cohen explained that an Administrative Design Review is only required when an applicant wants to depart from the design standards. Commissioner Moss-Thomas clarified that she is not suggesting that all self-storage facility applications must go through Administrative Design Review. She is simply suggesting that it not be eliminated as an option for self-storage facilities.

Director Markle explained that SMC 20.40.505.C.9 would require self-storage facilities to adhere strictly to the adopted standards, and there would be no opportunity for an administrative variance. If the Commission is not concerned about strict compliance with the standards, they could allow staff to administer departures through the Administrative Design Review process. Commissioner Moss-Thomas noted that allowing departures would be consistent with what is currently allowed for all other types of commercial development.

COMMISSIONER MOSS MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.505.C.9 BE ELIMINATED IN ITS ENTIRETY. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Chang asked about the potential impact of eliminating Item 9. As an example of a potential problem, Commissioner Maul advised that an applicant could request a code departure for the requirement of 50% glazing on the ground floor. Mr. Cohen reminded the Commission that requests for departures from the Commercial Design Standards must meet one of two criteria: 1) it must meet the purposes of the Commercial Design Standards, or 2) it must have a hardship. Rather than simply allowing a departure, staff tries to negotiate with applicants for additional design elements as a tradeoff.

Commissioner Chang asked how cost comes into play when applicants request code departures. Mr. Cohen answered that cost cannot specifically play into the decision making, but staff does look for parity when negotiating with applicants. The idea is that design standards, by regulation, do not always produce the best product, even though that is the intent. Flexibility allows staff to work with applicants to make a project look better in a different way.

Vice Chair Montero referred to SMC 20.40.050.C.8, which prohibits un-backed, non-composite sheet metal products that can easily dent. Commissioner Maul asked if a product that comes as a sandwich panel or a sheet that is applied to a wall would be considered “backed.” Mr. Cohen answered that the Commercial Design Standards allow cladding, and they also look at how the façade is inset or stepped back and color changes. They have departed from some of the requirements to actually get better quality cladding as a tradeoff. Vice Chair Montero also referred to SMC 20.40.050.C.7 and asked who would determine what a “muted tone” is. Mr. Cohen clarified that the additional design standards laid out in SMC 20.40.050.C would supplement the Commercial Design Standards and would not be

negotiable. If Item C.9 is eliminated, then departures from the Commercial Design Standards would also be allowed for self-service storage facilities.

THE MOTION CARRIED 3-2, WITH VICE CHAIR MONTERO AND COMMISSIONER MALEK VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas explained that the existing Commercial Design Standards require 50% glazing and 12-foot ceilings on the ground floor for the first 20 feet in depth. Because the standard would apply to just the front portion of the ground floor, the public concern about losing the entire first floor would not be an issue.

Director Markle referred to the new language proposed by staff for second sentence in SMC 20.40.050.A.1, which prohibits self-storage facilities from locating on a corner on an arterial street.

COMMISSIONER MALEK MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.050.A.1 BE AMENDED BY CHANGING THE SECOND SENTENCE TO READ, “FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS CRITERION, CORNERS ARE DEFINED AS ALL PRIVATE PROPERTY ADJACENT TO TWO OR MORE INTERSECTING ARTERIAL STREETS FOR A MINIMUM DISTANCE OF 200 FEET IN LENGTH BY A WIDTH OF 200 FEET AS MEASURED FROM THE PROPERTY LINES THAT FACE THAT ARTERIALS.” COMMISSIONER MOSS-THOMAS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSIONER MAUL MOVED THAT SMC 20.40.050.C.8 BE AMENDED TO ADD “AT THE FIRST FLOOR” AFTER THE WORD “DENT.” THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas summarized that the proposed changes to the Use Table (Table 20.40.130) would allow self-storage facilities in the CB and MB zones, but not in the TC and NB zones.

THE MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT DRAFT ORDINANCE 765 AND THE ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT CODE CHANGES AS PROPOSED BY STAFF WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AS AMENDED. COMMISSIONER MALEK SECONDED THE MOTION.

The Commission took a 5-minute break at 9:25 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:30 p.m.

STUDY ITEM: 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Staff Presentation

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the State Growth Management Act (GMA) limits review of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to no more than once per year. To ensure that the public can view the proposals in a citywide context, the City creates a docket or list of the amendments that will be considered each year. The City Council set the final list in June with 8 amendments: 3 privately-initiated amendments and 5 city-initiated.

Staff reviewed each of the proposed amendments with the Commission as follows:

- **Amendment 1** would amend Land Use Policy LU-47, which considers annexation of 145th Street adjacent to the southern border of the City. This amendment was also on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket and was bumped to 2016. Staff is not prepared to bring it forward yet, and is recommending it be placed on the 2017 docket.

None of the Commissioners had questions relative to this amendment.

- **Amendment 2** is consideration of amendments to the Point Wells Subarea Plan as described in the Staff Report. This amendment has also been on the City's docket for a while. Staff is recommending that it be bumped to the 2017 docket.

None of the Commissioners had questions relative to this amendment.

- **Amendment 3** would amend the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Master Plan. The Parks Department is currently working on the PROS Master Plan update, which will hopefully be adopted next year. Staff is recommending that this amendment be bumped to the 2017 docket.

None of the Commissioners had questions relative to this amendment.

- **Amendment 4** would amend Transportation Policy T-44 by adding a Volume Over Capacity (V/C) Ratio for Collector Arterial Streets. The amendment was privately initiated. The City does not currently have a V/C ratio for Collector Arterial Streets. Staff is not recommending approval of the amendment.

Ms. Dedinski cautioned that applying the proposed V/C ratio standard in a widespread manner and more rigidly than it already is would limit the City's ability to accommodate growth in a flexible way. Also, the only mitigation strategy is to widen roadways, which might not be the kind of thing that communities want to see on local streets or collector arterials.

Ms. Dedinski said the City Council directed staff to study the amendment as part of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) update, which has not yet started. In an effort to get information before the Commission, she reviewed the 2011 TMP modeling effort, which modeled the collector arterial network with relation to the V/C standard. From that static model, she saw that the City does have streets that would fail the V/C standard. That means the City would have to restructure its Transportation Impact Fee to accommodate an additional growth project, which would be costly because the only way to get at the V/C ratio is by widening the roadway to add more lanes to accommodate more traffic. The main thing to consider is whether that would be the right fit for the street and would that be the goal they want to achieve with the Transportation Impact Fee.

Ms. Dedinski advised that, in considering an updated model as part of the TMP Update, it is likely that other collector arterials would also fail the V/C standard, and the City would once again have to revisit additional growth projects, which would mean widening roadways. Examples of streets that would exceed the threshold include Fremont Avenue North and 196th Street. Commissioner Chang

asked if adding lanes would be the only way to address potential failures. Ms. Dedinski answered affirmatively, according to the City's current framework. There are other methodologies for concurrency that get at the heart of the City's concerns, and what they have been directed to study as part of the TMP update is a multi-modal level of service that encompasses sidewalks and non-motorized facilities, etc. The current concurrency standard only really addresses vehicles. While this approach is easy to apply, it has implications as to what happens with roads.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked Ms. Dedinski to provide a description of a collector arterial. Ms. Dedinski explained that principle and minor streets are the main arterials through the City and carry the largest amounts of traffic. The collector arterials provide a supporting framework for feeding the principle and minor arterials. They provide connections to the communities and neighborhoods. At the request of Commissioner Moss-Thomas, Ms. Dedinski provided a map to illustrate the collector arterial infrastructure.

Given that the amendment was proposed by residents of Richmond Beach, Commissioner Moss-Thomas said she assumes the assumption for promoting the amendment is the thought that if a road only has a certain capacity, the City cannot allow the development that will overwhelm the current capacity of the road. Ms. Dedinski agreed that is the idea. Staff's recommendation is to specifically focus on the Richmond Beach (Point Wells) component in order to avoid unintended consequences. Staff does not want the policy to be applied to all collector arterials, as they don't want the unintended consequences to spiral out from the Point Wells site. For example, one unintended consequence would be that the City must update its Transportation Impact Fee Structure to include a growth project for Freemont Avenue North, which would probably require right-of-way acquisition and be quite costly. This would increase costs to developers and put the City on the hook to complete the growth project. It would also have some implications in the future when the City updates its traffic model for other streets, meaning more widening on more streets.

Commissioner Chang said it does not make sense to her that the proposed amendment would imply that the City has to widen as opposed to certain projects could not happen. Ms. Dedinski agreed that the V/C ratio would limit growth until the infrastructure is in place to support it. That means it could potentially limit build-out at the Point Wells site because it requires right-of-way. However, on roadways that are already at the standard or near, it would also put the City on the hook for widening roadways and planning for growth projects to accommodate those. Although the V/C on Richmond Beach Drive is currently very low and is unlikely to reach the .9 V/C ratio unless development occurs at Point Wells, that would not be the case if applied citywide. All of the locations where potential problems could occur will be identified as part of the modeling that is done for the TMP Update in 2017.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked what criteria the City uses to upgrade a collector arterial to a minor arterial. Ms. Dedinski said the last time this occurred was as part of the TMP Update that occurred in 2007. Usually, this change is justified by increased traffic volumes and supporting land uses. Commissioner Moss-Thomas said that if those factors continue and there is a lot of congestion, the City could reclassify a roadway from a collector to a minor arterial. Ms. Dedinski agreed and said another alternative is proposed in Amendment 8, which would provide a supplemental level of service for the single roadway they are really concerned about.

- **Amendment 5** would clean up Land Use Policies LU-63, LU-64, LU-65, LU-66 and LU-67. These all reference an outdated King County Countywide Planning Policy.

None of the Commissioners had questions relative to this amendment.

- **Amendment 6** would amend Point Wells Subarea Plan Policy PW-12 by adding a separate limitation about the maximum number of vehicle trips entering a day on the City's road network from and to Point Wells. As proposed, the capacity should not exceed the spare capacity of Richmond Beach Road west of 8th Avenue NW under the City's V/C ratios. This is a privately initiated amendment.

Ms. Dedinski advised that staff is not opposed to the concept proposed in the amendment, but it is redundant with the language proposed in Amendment 8. Staff is recommending approval of Amendment 8.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas asked if "spare capacity" is a phrase put forward by the proponent of the amendment or if it is a common phrase. Ms. Dedinski explained that V/C refers to the actual measured volume of the roadway over the capacity of the roadway, and makes sense in the context of the proposed amendment. It is a common planning tool, and the baseline planning level capacities are assigned by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). The City further refines the V/C ratio in the TMP model. For example, for the capacity of the referenced Richmond Beach Road (west of 8th), if there is an assigned capacity per lane of 800 vehicles per hour, the V/C ratio would be the amount left after the current volumes are deducted out.

Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that Amendment 6 would only be redundant if Amendment 8 is adopted in some form to address this issue. Ms. Dedinski explained that the intent of Amendment 6 is to be very specific and direct and to allow less wiggle room from the current Level of Service (LOS) Standards. But it is actually redundant to the existing citywide LOS Standard, which is .9 V/C. The proposed amendment would simply reiterate that it is .9 V/C for Richmond Beach Road. It would do the same thing as the current citywide standard is already doing. The intent is to not allow the City to allow it to go higher. For example, on 15th Avenue NE, the City has allowed the V/C to go up to 1.1 to address safety issues and neighborhood right-of-way constraints.

Commissioner Chang asked if the City is allowed to exceed the .9 V/C if the intersection is still working at a certain LOS Standard. Ms. Dedinski answered affirmatively. She explained the V/C ratio is a supplemental LOS Standard, and that the intent of the amendment is to keep the V/C at .9 on all legs Richmond Beach Road. Commissioner Maul commented that the V/C Standard is for peak hour situations and has nothing to do with the 4,000-vehicle maximum. Ms. Dedinski agreed and said the two do not conflict with one another. The V/C standard simply provides an added measure of protection.

- **Amendment 7** would amend the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan to move policies related to the 145th Street Station Subarea Plan, amend the text, and amend the borders of the Southeast

Neighborhood Subarea Plan. The City just adopted the 145th Street Station Area Plan, and applicable policies from the Southeast Neighborhood Subarea Plan were moved into the 145th Plan, and the borders need to be amended so they no longer overlap.

None of the Commissioners had questions relative to this amendment.

- **Amendment 8** would add a new Point Wells Subarea Plan Policy adopting a V/C ratio of 0.65 or lower for Richmond Beach Drive northwest of 196th Street. This is a privately-initiated amendment, as well.

Ms. Dedinski clarified that, in addition to the redundant language in Amendment 6, Amendment 8 proposes an additional supplemental LOS Standard for Richmond Beach Drive, specifically. She recalled that Mr. McCormick commented earlier in the meeting, asking for a lower V/C standard. She cautioned that the City already has a table in the TMP that outlines what each V/C range relates to in terms of LOS A through F. Going any lower would make the V/C questionably defensible from a legal perspective because .65 is already an LOS B within the TMP, and this is not typically defined as a failure.

Mr. Szafran advised that a public hearing on the proposed amendments is scheduled for November 17th.

Public Comment

There was no one in the audience who indicated a desire to comment.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Markle did not have any additional items to report on.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Letter to the City Council

The Commission reviewed the letter that was drafted as a report to the City Council of the Commission's most recent activities. Commissioner Moss-Thomas pointed out that the letter does not include the Commission's recent discussions and public hearing on the proposed Development Code amendments related to Temporary Encampments. She reviewed that the Commission postponed its recommendation and continued the hearing. She suggested it would be helpful to have a discussion with the City Council to learn more about the goals and objectives they want to achieve regarding the matter. The Commissioners agreed it should be added as a topic of discussion at their joint meeting with the City Council on November 28th. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor agreed to forward the Commissioners a copy of the resolution the City Council adopted on homelessness.

Mr. Cohen explained that the memorandum that is prepared for the joint meeting will list a number of topics the Commission has discussed and wants to make a priority. The proposed amendments related

to Temporary Encampments could be added to the list as an issue for discussion. The Commissioners agreed that would be appropriate.

Commissioner Malek requested a copy of the 2017 Draft Budget, as well as a list of the Council's 2017 goals. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor advised that the City Council is slated to adopt the 2017 Budget following a public hearing on November 24th. She agreed to forward the Commissioners a link to the draft budget, which is available on line. Commissioner Malek felt it would be helpful for the Commission to understand where the City Council is looking at spending time and money and how the goals align with that. This will enable the Commission to better align its time and initiatives with those of the Council. Mr. Cohen said the joint meeting agenda will include a discussion of the Council's priorities and goals.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no reports of committees or Commissioners.

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Szafran advised that a public hearing on the draft Comprehensive Plan amendments is scheduled for November 17th. Assistant City Attorney Ainsworth-Taylor reminded the Commissioners that, at their last meeting, they continued the study session for the Development Code batch amendments. The Commission agreed to add the amendments to the November 17th meeting agenda. Mr. Szafran noted that a public hearing on the Development Code amendments is scheduled for December 1st.

Mr. Szafran reminded the Commission that the joint meeting with the City Council is scheduled for November 28th at 5:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Easton Craft
Chair, Planning Commission

Lisa Basher
Clerk, Planning Commission